



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/805,818      | 03/22/2004  | Chun Kong Li         | 203248-0094         | 1485             |

1131 7590 07/28/2006

MICHAEL BEST & FRIEDRICH LLP  
Two Prudential Plaza  
180 North Stetson Avenue, Suite 2000  
CHICAGO, IL 60601

EXAMINER

MCGRAW, TREVOR EDWIN

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3752

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

## Interview Summary

Application No.

10/805,818

Applicant(s)

LI, CHUN KONG

Examiner

Trevor McGraw

Art Unit

3752

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Trevor McGraw.

(3) Mr. David Rosenblatt.

(2) Eric Keasel.

(4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 20 July 2006.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-15.

Identification of prior art discussed: Elkins et al. (US4,275,908).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

JUSTINE R. YU

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Rosenblatt explained the ball and socket joint for which Applicant's desire to manufacture a less expensive ball and socket joint arrangement. Mr. Rosenblatt explained the invention components and how they fit together with each other where the collar and ball are integral and how Mr. Rosenblatt felt it was different from the prior art of record specifically the '908 reference and with respect to electroplating the outer portion of the skirt. Examiners felt with Mr. Rosenblatt's explanation that Mr. Rosenblatt is describing a method of manufacturing as opposed to an apparatus as the present claims. Examiner's discussed with Mr. Rosenblatt that he can not claim an intermediate process to overcome the prior art and that even if an amended claim can overcome the 102 (b) rejection with the '908 reference that a 103 rejection could be made in regard to the ball of the '908 reference. Mr. Rosenblatt went into detail about how the invention is a one piece structure and not a two piece structure and that his language "integrally formed" in the amended claim 1 is made 1 time as one solid piece. The Examiner's also brought to Mr. Rosenblatt's attention that the amended claim 1 as written is written as a jeppson claim where the desired amended limitations are within the admitted prior art preamble of the claim. Mr. Rosenblatt then brought to the Examiners attention to claim 10 and 12 and that the prior art reference failed to teach any of the limitations of the claims and that claim 10 would be added to claim 12 in an amendment. The Examiner's took Mr. Rosenblatt's thoughts into consideration and informed Mr. Rosenblatt that another search would be performed. The Examiners also informed Mr. Rosenblatt that whatever coverage Mr. Rosenblatt would like to receive for an invention should be positively claimed so that the scope of the invention is clear for the record. Interview commenced at 3:35 pm est. and concluded at 4:27 p.m. est. on Thursday July 20, 2006..